

Date: Fri, 25 Mar 94 04:30:08 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #149
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 25 Mar 94 Volume 94 : Issue 149

Today's Topics:

Rich has flipped out (was: Morse Whiners)
Scanner laws in Northern VA?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 24 Mar 1994 05:49:51 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
Subject: Rich has flipped out (was: Morse Whiners)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <764402816snx@skyld.grendel.com> jangus@skyld.grendel.com (Jeffrey D. Angus) writes:

>

>In article <Cn2Is7.LMG@murdoch.acc.Virginia.EDU> jeg7e@Hopper.itc.Virginia.EDU
writes:

>

> Commenting on Jeff Herman and sums it up with...

>

> > I don't (hardly) expect you to be able to understand this.

Jeff#2: I can't seem to locate this article you've quoted. Could you please
provide it in full for me?

Jeff#1 NH6IL

Date: Thu, 24 Mar 1994 14:05:24 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
news.intercon.com!psinntp!psinntp!psinntp!pbs.org!jernandez.pbs.org!
user@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Scanner laws in Northern VA?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Excuse the interruption. There is a law against carrying scanners in Northern VA (and I am sure other states like NJ) unless you have a permit. These permits are issued to volunteer rescue workers primarily. My question is, "Are licensed Amateur radio operators excused from getting the permit?" Thank you in advance.

John J. Ernandez

Date: Wed, 23 Mar 94 23:23:57 -0500
From: yale.edu!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@yale.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2mdgcc\$4g5@paperboy.ids.net>, <pA7NoFX.cecilmoore@delphi.com>,
<1994Mar23.044112.5182@beacons.cts.com>
Subject : Re: Morse Whiners

Kevin Sanders <kevin@beacons.cts.com> writes:

> Thank goodness this is not the way the airwaves are managed. If
>it were, we would have lost *all* our spectrum long ago to commercial
>interests.

Are you kidding? A good percentage of the homesteaders of the radio spectrum were hams.

> Think of our spectrum as a national forest. It exists for all
>amateurs to use, experiment with, and serve the public with. You need

I believe the government should own absolutely nothing. I remember when the hams were driven completely off their frequencies by the government in the name of national security... It worked for Hitler also.

73, CecilMoore@delphi.com

Date: Thu, 24 Mar 1994 05:39:26 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <RFM.94Mar18153733@urth.eng.sun.com>, <Cn1Jys.28z@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <22MAR199406565240@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>

Subject : Re: Rich has flipped out (was: Morse Whiners)

In article <22MAR199406565240@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov> stocker@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov (ERICH FRANZ STOCKER) writes:

>

>Well! As a matter of fact the work ethic as practiced by capitalism is not
>the work ethic as preached by the puritains. In captialism, regardless of
>how hard the work, the pay is not necessarily commensurate with it. Ergo,

Erich: I finished my article by saying: study hard, work hard ...
In other words, first strive to get an education (night school, trade school, community college are all alternatives to the traditional university education). Once someone has an education/skill and they combine that with a diligent attitude towards work then success will surely follow.

>the late 19th and early 20th century where workers including children were
>working up to 16 hrs a day with extremely low pay. You might be interested
>in the congressional records of hearing on these issues. Here we had an
>example of people working tremendously hard and not getting any reward for
>their labors.

And neither did they have trade skills nor an education. With all the social programs for education and job training available today no one need suffer as these people did. Our community college system here in Hawaii is practically tuition-free. Those having to hold daytime jobs can take night or weekend classes. If one want to better their life nothing is holding them back except laziness.

>

>On the other hand during this same period, capitalistics like JP Morgan, John
>Ford, John Rockefeller, et al were doing very little work and getting very
>richly rewarded for it. Why? The general answer is "ideas" and "risk". This

It helps to have a father who worked hard and became rich. A wealthy father makes his son's life much easier, and enables his son to take risks:

>individuals supposedly had an outstanding idea and were willing to take
>financial, and sometimes personal, risks to bring about their ideas. As a
>result, the purtain ethic was also subverted to say that their success in
>such risk taking was a sign that they were among the "favored".

>.....

Moral: Study the code and theory to get your HF access.

Jeff NH6IL

Date: Thu, 24 Mar 94 08:58:40 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!
usenet@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Bu9twBp.cecilmoore@delphi.com>, <2miha7\$k6r@Times.Stanford.EDU>,
<2mktlh\$r09@news.iastate.edu>
Subject : Re: Morse Whiners

William J Turner <wjturner@iastate.edu> writes:

>Then the Air Force shut down SAC...

Yes and no. They actually merged it into a new Air Combat Command, erasing
the divisions that existed between SAC and the Tactical Air Command.

Date: 24 Mar 1994 16:25:33 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!
swrinde!sgiblab!sgigate.sgi.com!olivea!news.bbn.com!levin@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <BUzP4Jj.edellers@delphi.com>, <2mii21\$h0v@ccnet.ccnet.com>,
<p6z0gPq.edellers@delphi.com>
Subject : Re: Coord. priority for open repeaters

Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:

|The way voice repeaters would lock out lids is to shut down as soon as they
|hear the creep, then come back up later. If that fails, it seems to me that
|the trustee can write to the guy, tell him that he is not welcome on the
|repeater, and that if he attempts to use it again that he'll be reported to
|the FCC -- which, as has been noted, most certainly allows repeater trustees
|to exercise control.

A most peculiar interpretation of (a) the rules and (b) the way things
work.

The owners/operators/trustees of the closed repeater can deny you the
use of their repeater by closing it down. This they do at the cost of
denying its service to other users, and it's a tradeoff as to whether

it's worth doing that to keep the unwanted user off.

On the other hand, that's about all they can do, and here's why. No individual owns a frequency (though often some think they do, on UHF or 75 meters, it doesn't matter). There are rules about how conflicts between repeaters are resolved and the coordinating body has some authority in this area. The only other rules I know of that might apply are those regarding deliberate and / or malicious interference. And when some operator persists in communicating via the repeater, if he or she does this without causing interference, the repeater owners or trustees wouldn't have a leg to stand on with the FCC, even if the FCC would listen. That operator has broken no rules. So the only choice for the trustee is either to shut down the repeater or to ignore the user.

[Disclaimer: I'll admit in advance that there are no closed repeaters that I know of in my area (south central NH) - there are closed autopatches, of course - so I don't know how operators of these repeaters would behave in real life.]

/JBL KD10N

=

Nets: levin@bbn.com | "The Pledge of Allegiance says '..with liberty and
pots: (617)873-3463 | justice for all'. What part of 'all' don't you
KD10N | understand?" --Rep. Pat Schroeder (D) Colorado

Date: 24 Mar 1994 16:36:13 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!
newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!wjturner@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2miha7\$K6r@Times.Stanford.EDU>, <2mktlh\$r09@news.iastate.edu>,
<pU7uRgI.edellers@delphi.com>tat
Subject : Re: Morse Whiners

In article <pU7uRgI.edellers@delphi.com> Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:

>Yes and no. They actually merged it into a new Air Combat Command, erasing
>the divisions that existed between SAC and the Tactical Air Command.

Again, yes and no. They disbanded TAC, SAC, and MAC and formed ACC and AMC. While ACC does do most of the functions of SAC and TAC together, it does not do all of them. SAC's KC-135s, KC-10s, etc, went to AMC, and all missels are now under AFSPACECOM.

The point is, they *did* shut down SAC, but this is not relevant anymore to

this thread, and should be continued elsewhere.

--

```
Will Turner,  NORDV      -----  
wjturner@iastate.edu    | "Are you going to have any professionalism, |  
twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu | or am I going to have to beat it into you?" |  
TURNERW@vax1d.ameslab.gov -----
```

Date: Fri, 25 Mar 94 04:56:50 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2mii21\$h0v@ccnet.ccnet.com>, <p6z0gPq.edellers@delphi.com>,
<mp3fntINNk13@news.bbn.com>
Subject : Re: Coord. priority for open repeaters

In article <mp3fntINNk13@news.bbn.com>, Joel B Levin <levin@bbn.com> wrote:
>And when some operator persists in communicating via the repeater, if
>he or she does this without causing interference, the repeater owners
>or trustees wouldn't have a leg to stand on with the FCC, even if the
>FCC would listen. That operator has broken no rules. So the only
>choice for the trustee is either to shut down the repeater or to
>ignore the user.

You must have missed the letter from the chief of the FCC's private radio bureau that says that any trustee can prohibit any operator from using a repeater. Combine that with the FCC's oft-repeated position that the band plans represent good amateur practice within the meaning of the rules, and someone who insists on transmitting on a repeater input when he has been advised that he is not permitted to use the repeater would be in violation of the rules. I don't know of any cases where that has been held, yet, and don't expect there to be any so far - but just wait...that's a logical conclusion to what they've already said.

The simple fact of the matter is that nobody has the right to use another's amateur station without his permission. Arguments about freedom to use a frequency are irrelevant: it's the use of the station that the FCC has said is important.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
"The difference between baseball and politics is that, in baseball, if you
get caught stealing, you're out!" -- Ed Shanks

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #149
